

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
EL PASO DIVISION**

BRANDON CALLIER,

Plaintiff,

V.

UNITED DOCU PREP, INC. a California Corporation and **SAQIB KHAN**

Defendants.

EP21 CV0189

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

NOW COMES PLAINTIFF BRANDON CALLIER with his Original Complaint herein
and alleges and states as follows:

PARTIES

1. The Plaintiff is BRANDON CALLIER, a natural person, and was present in Texas for all calls, in this case in El Paso County.
2. Defendant UNITED DOCU PREP, INC. (“United”) is a California Corporation with a principal address of 4801 Truxtun Avenue, STE 200, Bakersfield, California 93309, and can be served via registered agent Saqib Khan, 4801 Truxtun Avenue, STE 200, Bakersfield, California 93309.
3. Defendant SAQIB KHAN (“Khan”) is a natural person, resident of California, and the Chief Executive Officer of United Docu Prep, Inc and can be served at 5109 Pelican Hill Drive Bakersfield, California 93312.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. **Jurisdiction.** This Court has federal-question subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's TCPA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the TCPA is a federal statute. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 565 U.S. 368, 372 (2012). This Court has supplemental subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claim arising under Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053 because that claim arises from the same nucleus of operative fact, i.e., Defendants' telemarketing robocalls to Plaintiff; adds little complexity to the case; and doesn't seek money damages, so it is unlikely to predominate over the TCPA claims.
5. **Personal Jurisdiction.** This Court has general personal jurisdiction over the defendant because they have repeatedly placed calls to Texas residents, and derive revenue from Texas residents, and they sell goods and services to Texas residents, including the Plaintiff. Defendant Khan approved of the contracts and purposefully directed or conspired to direct unlawful robocalls into the forum state.
6. **Venue.** Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1)-(2) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims—the calls and sale of goods and services directed at Texas residents, including the Plaintiff—occurred in this District and because the Plaintiff resides in this District. Residing in the Western District of Texas when he received a substantial if not every single call from the Defendants that are the subject matter of this lawsuit.
7. This Court has venue over the defendants because the calls at issue were sent by or on behalf of the above-named defendants to the Plaintiff, a Texas resident.

THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION

ACT OF 1991, 47 U.S.C. § 227

8. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to restrict the use of sophisticated telemarketing equipment that could target millions of consumers *en masse*. Congress found that these calls were not only a nuisance and an invasion of privacy to consumers specifically but were also a threat to interstate commerce generally. *See* S. Rep. No. 102-178, at 2-3 (1991), as reprinted in 1991 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1968, 1969-71.
9. The TCPA makes it unlawful “to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service.” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
10. The TCPA makes it unlawful “to initiate any telephone call to any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the called party, unless the call is initiated for emergency purposes, is made solely pursuant to the collection of a debt owed to or guaranteed by the United States, or is exempted by rule or order” of the Federal Communication Commission (“FCC”). 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).
11. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of § 227(b). 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).
12. Separately, the TCPA bans making telemarketing calls without a do-not-call policy available upon demand. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(1).¹

¹ *See* Code of Federal Regulations, Title 47, Parts 40 to 60, at 425 (2017) (codifying a June 26, 2003 FCC order).

13. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of § 227(c) or a regulation promulgated thereunder. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).
14. According to findings of the FCC, the agency vested by Congress with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls and can be costly and inconvenient.
15. The FCC also recognizes that “wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used.” *In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, 14115 ¶ 165 (2003).
16. The FCC requires “prior express written consent” for all autodialed or prerecorded telemarketing robocalls to wireless numbers and residential lines. In particular:[A] consumer’s written consent to receive telemarketing robocalls must be signed and be sufficient to show that the consumer: (1) received clear and conspicuous disclosure of the consequences of providing the requested consent, *i.e.*, that the consumer will receive future calls that deliver prerecorded messages by or on behalf of a specific seller; and (2) having received this information, agrees unambiguously to receive such calls at a telephone number the consumer designates. In addition, the written agreement must be obtained without requiring, directly or indirectly, that the agreement be executed as a condition of purchasing any good or service.
17. *In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 FCC Rcd. 1830, 1844 ¶ 33 (2012) (footnote and internal quotation marks omitted). FCC regulations “generally establish that the party on whose behalf a solicitation is made bears ultimate responsibility for any violations.” *In the Matter of Rules and Regulations*

Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991, 10 FCC Rcd. 12391, 12397 ¶ 13 (1995).

18. The FCC confirmed this principle in 2013, when it explained that “a seller ... may be held vicariously liable under federal common law principles of agency for violations of either section 227(b) or section 227(c) that are committed by third-party telemarketers.” *In the Matter of the Joint Petition Filed by Dish Network, LLC*, 28 FCC Rcd. 6574, 6574 ¶ 1 (2013).

19. Under the TCPA, a text message is a call. *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946, 951 – 52 (9th Cir. 2009).

20. A corporate officer involved in the telemarketing at issue may be personally liable under the TCPA. *E.g., Jackson Five Star Catering, Inc. v. Beason*, Case No. 10-10010, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 159985, at *10 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 8, 2013) (“[M]any courts have held that corporate actors can be individually liable for violating the TCPA where they had direct, personal participation in or personally authorized the conduct found to have violated the statute.” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Maryland v. Universal Elections*, 787 F. Supp. 2d 408, 415 – 16 (D. Md. 2011) (“If an individual acting on behalf of a corporation could avoid individual liability, the TCPA would lose much of its force.”).

The Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053

21. The Texas Business and Commerce code has an analogous portion that is related to the TCPA and was violated in this case.

22. The Plaintiff may seek damages under this Texas law for violations of 47 USC 227 or subchapter A and seek \$500 in statutory damages or \$1500 for willful or knowing damages.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff’s number is on the national Do Not Call registry and has been for two years prior to

the calls in this case.

24. Plaintiff received a series automated phone calls from phone number 888-679-1501 beginning on July 23, 2021.
25. On July 26, 2021, Plaintiff received a call from phone number 888-679-1501. Plaintiff answered the phone and heard a prerecorded voice message stating “This is a general announcement that all student loan payments have been suspended until September. In October you will have to resume paying back the balance of your loans. A hardship waiver will be filed on your behalf so the suspension will not expire. If you are with Nelnet, Navient, Great Lakes or Sallie Mae please press three now.”
26. Plaintiff pressed “three” and was connected to a live representative who gave the misleading impression he was a federal employee by stating “Hello, thank you for calling the Federal Student Loan Center. How can I help you?”
27. Defendants’ representative told Plaintiff he could get 90% off of his student loan balance. The representative then asked Plaintiff information about his student loan account, finances, and income. He then said he was going to connect me to a “certified loan counselor.”
28. Defendants’ agent and/or employee solicited Plaintiff for “Student Loan Forgiveness” and then sent Plaintiff a contract from United Docu Prep, Inc.
29. Defendant Khan controls and dominates United Docu Prep, Inc. Defendant Khan authorized the telemarketing calls to Plaintiff, and either directly or indirectly controlled the persons who initiated the calls.
30. Defendant Khan allowed the telemarketers to access information and systems within their control for the purposes of marketing Defendant United’s products and services.
31. Defendant Khan approved, wrote or reviewed the script used by the telemarketers or United

Docu Prep, Inc. employees who initiated the calls.

32. Jane Does initiated the calls to Plaintiff pursuant to a contract or agreement with Defendant United, the terms of which include payments and compensation to telemarketers that was approved by Defendant Khan.
33. Defendant Khan purposely directed telemarketing calls to be made to residents of Texas and had direct, personal participation in causing the illegal telephone calls to be made.
34. The Plaintiff has received at least 7 calls and texts over five (5) days to his cell phone, 915-245-4374 without consent and not related to an emergency purpose, soliciting the “Student Loan Forgiveness” products and services of Defendant United.
35. None of the telemarketers properly identified they worked for a company other, and through information and belief, the telemarketers were employees of Defendant United.
36. Plaintiff received the following calls and texts from the Defendants (Table A).

Date	Time	Phone Number
7/26/2021	3:45 PM	661-402-3475
7/26/2021	3:23 PM	661-402-3475
7/26/2021	3:16 PM	888-679-1501
7/26/2021	2:27 PM	888-679-1501
7/26/2021	1:20 PM	888-679-1501
7/23/2021	8:59 AM	888-679-1501
7/23/2021	8:34 AM	888-679-1501

37. Each and every call was placed without the maintenance of an internal do-not-call policy. Each and every call failed to identify the telemarketers and parties they were calling on behalf of. Each and every call was placed without training their agents/employees on the use of an internal do-not-call policy.
38. Mr. Callier has limited data storage capacity on his cellular telephone. Incoming telemarketing calls consumed part of this capacity.
39. No emergency necessitated the calls

- 40. Each call was sent by an ATDS.
- 41. On information and belief, the Defendants did not have a written do-not-call policy while it was sending Mr. Callier the unsolicited calls
- 42. On information and belief, the Defendants did not train its agents who engaged in telemarketing on the existence and use of any do-not-call list.

DIRECT LIABILITY

- 43. The Defendants' scheme involves the use of illegal robocalling to promote their services.
- 44. Defendants' practice of outsourcing its robocalling to a third-party company does not absolve them from direct liability under the TCPA.
- 45. On May 9, 2013, the FCC confirmed this principle in a Declaratory Ruling holding that sellers may not avoid liability by outsourcing telemarketing:

[A]llowing the seller to avoid potential liability by outsourcing its telemarketing activities to unsupervised third parties would leave consumers in many cases without an effective remedy for telemarketing intrusions. This would particularly be so if the telemarketers were judgment proof, unidentifiable, or located outside the United States, as is often the case. Even where third-party telemarketers are identifiable, solvent, and amendable to judgment, limiting liability to the telemarketer that physically places the calls would make enforcement in many cases substantially more expensive and less efficient, since consumers (or law enforcement agencies) would be required to sue each telemarketer separately in order to obtain effective relief. As the FTC noted, because “[se]llers may have thousands of ‘independent’ telemarketers, suing one or a few of them is unlikely to make a substantive difference for consumer privacy.

May 2013 FCC Ruling, 28 FCC Rcd at 65 (¶ 37) (internal citations omitted).

THE SELLERS SHOULD BE HELD LIABLE TO UPHOLD THE DETERRENT EFFECT AND PURPOSE OF THE TCPA

- 46. As the court ruled in *Jackson v Caribbean Cruise Line, Inc.*, the defendant sellers should be held liable for their violations of the TCPA. Courts have looked at the purpose of the TCPA and found that not holding the sellers liable through vicarious liability would undermine the

purpose of the TCPA.

47. The entity in the application for “student loan forgiveness” should be deemed the beneficiary of the calls and held liable for damages under the TCPA under vicarious liability. Sellers are in the best position to monitor and police third party telemarketer’s compliance with the TCPA and to hold otherwise would leave consumers without an effective remedy for telemarketing intrusions.

INJURY, HARM, DAMAGES, and ACTUAL DAMAGES
AS A RESULT OF THE CALLS

48. Defendants’ calls harmed the Plaintiff by causing the very harm that Congress sought to prevent—a “nuisance and invasion of privacy.”
49. Defendants’ calls harmed the Plaintiff by trespassing upon and interfering with Plaintiff’s rights and interests in Plaintiff’s cellular telephone.
50. Defendants’ calls harmed the Plaintiff by trespassing upon and interfering with Plaintiff’s rights and interests in Plaintiff’s cellular telephone line.
51. Defendants’ calls harmed the Plaintiff by intruding upon Plaintiff’s seclusion.
52. The Plaintiff has been harmed, injured, and damages by the calls including, but not limited to:
- Reduced Device Storage space
 - Reduced data plan usage
 - Invasion of privacy
 - Lost time tending to text messages
 - Decreased cell phone battery life

- More frequent charging of my cell phone resulting in reduced enjoyment and usage of my cell phone
- Reduced battery usage
- Annoyance
- Frustration
- Anger

The Plaintiff's cell phone is a residential number

53. The calls were to the Plaintiff's cellular phone 915-245-4374, which is the Plaintiff's personal cell phone that he uses for personal, family, and household use. The Plaintiff maintains no landline phones at his residence and has not done so for at least 10 years and primarily relies on cellular phones to communicate with friends and family. The Plaintiff also uses his cell phone for navigation purposes, sending and receiving emails, timing food when cooking, and sending and receiving text messages. The Plaintiff further has his cell phone registered in his personal name, pays the cell phone from his personal accounts, and the phone is not primarily used for any business purpose.

Violations of the Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053

54. The actions of the Defendants violated the Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053 by placing automated calls to a cell phone which violate 47 USC 227(b). The calls by the defendants violated Texas law by placing calls with a pre-recorded message to a cell phone which violate 47 USC 227(c)(5) and 47 USC 227(d) and 47 USC 227(d)(3) and 47 USC 227(e).
55. The calls by the Defendants violated Texas law by spoofing the caller ID's per 47 USC 227(e) which in turn violates the Texas statute.

I. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Non-Emergency Robocalls to Cellular Telephones, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A))

(Against All Defendants)

1. Mr. Callier realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

2. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates or agents constitute multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), by making non-emergency telemarketing robocalls to Mr. Callier's cellular telephone number without his prior express written consent.

3. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of at least \$500 in damages for each such violation. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

4. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of up to \$1,500 in damages for each such knowing or willful violation. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

5. Mr. Callier also seeks a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants and their affiliates and agents from making non-emergency telemarketing robocalls to cellular telephone numbers without the prior express written consent of the called party.

II. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Telemarketing Without Mandated Safeguards, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d))

(Against All Defendants)

1. Mr. Callier realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

2. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates or agents constitute multiple violations of FCC regulations by making telemarketing solicitations despite lacking:

a. a written policy, available upon demand, for maintaining a do-not-call list, in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(1);²

b. training for the individuals involved in the telemarketing on the existence of and use of a do-not-call list, in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(2);³ and,

c. in the solicitations, the name of the individual caller and the name of the person or entity on whose behalf the call is being made, in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(4).⁴

3. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of at least \$500 in damages for each such violation. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B).

4. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of up to \$1,500 in damages for each such knowing or willful violation. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

5. Mr. Callier also seeks a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants and their affiliates and agents from making telemarketing solicitations until and unless they (1) implement a do-not-call list and training thereon and (2) include the name of the individual caller and AFS's name in the solicitations.

² See *id.* at 425 (codifying a June 26, 2003 FCC order).

³ See *id.* at 425 (codifying a June 26, 2003 FCC order).

⁴ See *id.* at 425 – 26 (codifying a June 26, 2003 FCC order).

III. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

Violations of The Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053

1. Mr. Callier realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.
2. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants and/or their affiliates or agents constitute multiple violations of the **Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053**, by making non-emergency telemarketing robocalls to Mr. Callier's cellular telephone number without his prior express written consent in violation of 47 USC 227 et seq. The Defendants violated 47 USC 227(d) and 47 USC 227(d)(3) and 47 USC 227(e) by using an ATDS that does not comply with the technical and procedural standards under this subsection.
3. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of at least \$500 in damages for each such violation. **Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053(b)**
4. Mr. Callier is entitled to an award of up to \$1,500 in damages for each such knowing or willful violation. **Texas Business and Commerce Code 305.053(c)**.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Brandon Callier prays for judgment against the Defendants jointly and severally as follows:

- A. Leave to amend this Complaint to name additional DOESs as they are identified and to conform to the evidence presented at trial;
- B. A declaration that actions complained of herein by Defendants violate the TCPA and Texas state law;

C. An injunction enjoining Defendants and their affiliates and agents from engaging in the unlawful conduct set forth herein;

D. An award of \$3000 per call in statutory damages arising from the TCPA intentional violations jointly and severally against the corporation and individual for seven calls.

E. An award of \$1,500 in statutory damages arising from violations of the Texas Business and Commerce code 305.053;

F. An award to Mr. Callier of damages, as allowed by law under the TCPA;

G. An award to Mr. Callier of interest, costs and attorneys' fees, as allowed by law and equity

H. Such further relief as the Court deems necessary, just, and proper.

August 16, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,



Brandon Callier
Plaintiff Pro-se
6336 Franklin Trail
El Paso, TX 79912
Callier74@gmail.com